

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 15, 2006. Claims 1-8, 16-30 and 33-36 remain pending. Claims 1, 16, and 21 and are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, and 29-36 were rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,817,915 (*Kyogaku et al.*).

Independent Claim 1 recites a method for manufacturing an electron-emitting device. The method comprises a step for forming a solid-state insulating polymer film including a carbon atomic bond between a pair of electrodes formed on a substrate, a step for heating the polymer film to change the polymer film into an electro-conductive film, and a step for providing a potential difference between the pair of electrodes to energize electrically the electro-conductive film. The step for providing the potential difference is conducted after the step for heating the polymer film.

Claim 1 of *Kyogaku et al.* recites:

1. A method of manufacturing an electron source, comprising the steps of: (A) providing a substrate on which a plurality of units and wirings are arranged, each unit comprising a pair of electrodes and a polymer film for connecting the electrodes of the pair and the wirings respectively being connected to at least one of the plurality of units; (B) irradiating light onto a region of the substrate where two or more units and part of the wirings are arranged, to reduce resistivity of the polymer film in each of the two or more units; (C) forming a gap in a film obtained by performing the step (B), wherein for the irradiating light in step (B), a light absorbance of the wirings is lower than that of the electrodes.

Claim 6 of *Kyogaku et al.* depends from Claim 1, and recites further that the gap is formed by flowing an electric current through the film obtained by the step (B).

It is respectfully submitted, however, that Claim 1 of the present application is patentably distinguishable over claims 1 and 6 of *Kyogaku et al.* because those latter claims do not recite or suggest that the step for providing the potential difference is conducted after the step for heating the polymer film, as provided in Claim 1. If the Examiner disagrees, he is respectfully requested to point out where in claims 1 and 6 of *Kyogaku et al.* those features are recited.

Independent Claim 16 of the present application recites, in part, that the step for providing the potential difference is conducted after the step for illuminating the electron beam, and independent Claim 21 of the present application recites, in part, that the step for providing the potential difference is conducted after the step for illuminating light.

It is respectfully submitted that neither claim 1 nor claim 6 of *Kyogaku et al.* recites or suggests those features. Accordingly, Claims 16 and 21 are believed to be patentably distinguishable over those claims of *Kyogaku et al.*

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' attorney of record may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank A. DeLucia/

Frank A. DeLucia

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 42,476

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 623139v1